



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/702,226	10/31/2000	Steven E. Walak	BSI-469US	1298

7590 04/23/2003

Paul F. Prestia
Ratner & Prestia
Suite 301 One Westlakes Berwyn
PO Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980

EXAMINER

MATTHEWS, WILLIAM H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3738

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/702,226

Applicant(s)

WALAK, STEVEN E.

Examiner

William H. Matthews (Howie)

Art Unit

3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 February 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-15,20,21 and 25-47 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,16-19 and 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1,2,16-18, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Burmeister et al. WO 95/31945.

Burmeister et al. discloses in figures 1,5,6,8-11,14-16 multiple stent configurations comprising superelastic and plastically deformable sections.

Regarding claims 2 and 23, see lines 3-13 of page 13.

Regarding claims 17-18, see lines 12-18 of page 7.

3. Claims 1,2,16,17,19, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Heath US PN 5,725,570.

See figures 2-3, line 31 of col. 4 through line 9 of col. 5, and lines 31-49 of col. 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3738

5. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burmeister et al. WO 95/31945 in view of Alt US PN 6,217,607.

Burmeister et al. meets the limitations of claim 19 as described above but lacks the express disclosure of utilizing gold for the plastically deformable section. Note that Burmeister et al. discloses various alloys comprising gold on page 2, providing strands of platinum or tantalum for radiopacity, and that radiopaque portions or coatings may be included on any parts of the stents (lines 3-18 of page 13). Alt teaches the specific use of gold for a coating on a Nitinol stent to improve radiopacity of the stent.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the stent disclosed by Burmeister et al. to either substitute gold for the platinum or tantalum strands or to have coated portions of the stent with gold as taught by Alt in order to improve radiopacity of the stent.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,2,16-19,22-24 have been considered but are not persuasive.

With regard to Heath '570, Applicant contends Heath lacks longitudinal stripes because the stent filaments are braided into a tubular stent. The Examiner disagrees because figures 4-5b clearly show the filaments of the arranged such that longitudinal stripes exist.

With regard to Burmeister et al WO 95/31945, Applicant contends that the stent structure does not provide longitudinal stripes because the stent is braided into a tubular

Art Unit: 3738

stent or is layered sheets rolled into tubes. The Examiner disagrees because lines 7-11 of page 7 describe the stent configurations including those of figures 1,5,6,8-11 clearly showing longitudinal stripes. In addition, the braided filaments of figures 14-16 possess longitudinal stripes.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Matthews (Howie) whose telephone number is 703-305-0316. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:00-4:30 (Every other Friday off).

Art Unit: 3738


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine M. McDermott can be reached on 703-308-2111. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-2708 for regular communications and (703) 305-3590 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.



WHM

April 21, 2003



**CORRINE McDERMOTT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700**